

AB 599 Interagency Task Force (ITF)

Cal/EPA Headquarters Building
16th Floor, Room 1610
Sacramento, CA

Meeting Summary

Tuesday, July 2, 2002

ATTENDEES

ITF Members:

Al Vargas, CDFA
Gary Yamamoto, DHS
Dan Gallagher, DTSC
Carl Hauge, DWR
Lisa Babcock, SWRCB
John Troiano, DPR

Interested Parties:

Neil Dubrovsky, USGS
Ken Belitz, USGS (via telephone)
Tim Parker, Groundwater Resources Assoc.
Rob Swartz, DWR
Sarah Raker, SF Bay RWQCB
Lewis Angus, Central Coast RWQCB
Barbara Evoy, SWRCB
James Giannopoulos, SWRCB
John Borkovich, SWRCB

Convene Meeting

- Lisa Babcock opened the meeting at 9:40 am.

Approval of Minutes

- Minutes from the May 30, 2002, ITF meeting were approved by the ITF.
- John Troiano will not attend July 24th PAC meeting - Joe Marade will be his alternate.

Comments from ITF regarding draft Chapters 1 through 5:

ITF Groundwater Monitoring Program Summary Tables

- ITF members discussed refining the tables to reflect regulatory monitoring (data management review) versus “stand-alone” monitoring, sampling and assessments.

Action Items:

- ITF members will supply cost breakdown of monitoring programs to SWRCB to update tables by July 15.
- Chapter revisions from the ITF due to SWRCB by July 5.
- Suggestion of using “Sidebar Boxes” in the text of the report to enhance the report discussions.
- Estimate overall statewide cost of sampling and analyses by local water agencies to comply with drinking water standards. Check ACWA website for further information.

Data Management - Discussion of Tools (Chapter 5) - PAC Requested Item

James G. gave a brief overview of proposed tools that could be incorporated into GeoTracker as needed (handout).

Action Item: Recommendations regarding “tools”

- “How-to” web page for groundwater quality in a specific area will be presented by James at the next PAC meeting.

Public Access to Groundwater Data/Information (Chapter 6)

James G. led discussion on access issues to private/domestic wells. As mentioned at the last ITF meeting, water districts do not want groundwater well location information to be disclosed, following September 11. Main points of public access include the location of public and private wells and identification of potentially contaminating activities.

Action Item: The ITF needs to stress that the proposed comprehensive program will only be viable if it's based upon public trust.

Discussion of Products (Chapter 5)

Sarah R. and Rob Swartz gave a brief overview of the proposed individual basin reports. Their group created a set of recommendations regarding desired assessments/reports:

- State of the groundwater product
- State of individual basins

Action Item: Recommendations for “assessments”:

- “Surf your watershed” type icon (the water quality thermometer on USEPA website) could possibly be used for these reports
- Make the reports have links to other sites related to them; such as links to Consumer confidence reports.

***Update:** We have subsequently discussed this issue further and have the following suggestions:

- Change reporting frequency from "biennial" to "periodic" so the PAC can weigh-in. Rename the assessment reports "California Groundwater Quality Monitoring Reports."
- These reports would include both:
 - Data tabulation/statistical summaries calculated periodically for basins and the state
 - Basin wide assessments as developed depending on the priority of the basin
- Frame the usage of a groundwater quality "Thermometer" as an example and not necessarily an ITF recommendation. Cal/EPA or SWRCB environmental measures would be good to include also (EPIC, Strategic Plan).

Overview of draft report Chapters 1 through 5:

John B. led discussion with ITF on overview of the first five chapters. Specific edits were provided to John B. by July 5.

Action Item: Edits were made based by ITF suggestions and were to be forwarded to PAC for review and comment.

Comprehensive Groundwater Monitoring Plan (Chapter 7)

Neil Dubrovsky presented groundwater study in Modesto by using examples of how the plan could compare and contrast constituents present in groundwater. Recommendation that a “unit cost factor” be applied to the millions currently spent on monitoring to be applied for data evaluation and reporting.

Comments included:

- Of the 524 individual basins (DWR defined) in the state, only 99 basins have more than 20 public supply wells.
- Approximately 330,000 well driller reports have been digitized by DWR to 30 data points. However, no lithology descriptions were digitized.